



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/728,233

12/04/2003

Dennis Lawrence Nicholson

21765-2

7486

7590

05/01/2009

John S. Beulick  
Armstrong Teasdale LLP  
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600  
St. Louis, MO 63102

EXAMINER

LU, JIPING

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3743

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/01/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/728,233	<b>Applicant(s)</b> NICHOLSON, DENNIS LAWRENCE	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jiping Lu	<b>Art Unit</b> 3743	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jiping Lu. (3) Michael R. Anslinger.

(2) Robert B. Reeser, III. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 4/29/09.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Unverzagt (U. S. Pat. 6,471,091).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: No agreement was reached for the patentability of the claims. Applicant proposed to amend the claim to include third fastening mechanism and argued that the last five lines of paragraph 0018 of the specification shows the support for this third fastening mechanism and Unverzagt does not show a third mechanism. Examiner agreed that the proposed amendment would overcome the 112 first paragraph and 102(b) rejections.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

	/Jiping Lu/ Primary Examiner
--	---------------------------------